arXiv:0908.0349v4 [math.QA] 13 Feb 2010

Equivariant quantization of Poisson homogeneous spaces and Kostant's problem

E. Karolinsky, A. Stolin, and V. Tarasov

Abstract

We find a partial solution to the longstanding problem of Kostant concerning description of the so-called locally-finite endomorphisms of highest weight irreducible modules. The solution is obtained by means of its reduction to a far-reaching extension of the quantization problem. While the classical quantization problem consists in finding $\star$-product deformations of the commutative algebras of functions, we consider the case when the initial object is already a noncommutative algebra, the algebra of functions within q-calculus.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2000). 17B37, 17B10, 53D17, 53D55.

Key words: quantized universal enveloping algebra, Kostant's problem, highest weight module, equivariant quantization, reduced fusion element.

1 Introduction

Let $\check{U}_q\mathfrak{g}$ be the quantized universal enveloping algebra "of simply connected type" that corresponds to a finite dimensional split semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $L(\lambda)$ be the irreducible highest weight $\check{U}_q\mathfrak{g}$-module of highest weight λ. The aim of this paper is to show that for certain values of λ, the action map $\check{U}_q\mathfrak{g} \to \bigl(\operatorname{End} L(\lambda)\bigr)_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is surjective. Here $\bigl(\operatorname{End} L(\lambda)\bigr)_{\mathrm{fin}}$ stands for the locally finite part of $\operatorname{End} L(\lambda)$ with respect to the adjoint action of $\check{U}_q\mathfrak{g}$. For the Lie-algebraic case ($q = 1$), this problem is known as the classical Kostant's problem, see [3, 4, 10, 11]. The complete answer to it is still unknown even in the $q = 1$ case. However, there are examples of λ for which the action map $U(\mathfrak{g}) \to \bigl(\operatorname{End} L(\lambda)\bigr)_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is not surjective. Such examples exist even in the case $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A [12].

The main idea of our approach to Kostant's problem, both in the Lie-algebraic and quantum group cases, is that $\bigl(\operatorname{End} L(\lambda)\bigr)_{\mathrm{fin}}$ has two other presentations. First, it follows from the results of [8] that $\bigl(\operatorname{End} L(\lambda)\bigr)_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is canonically isomorphic to $\operatorname{Hom}_U\bigl(L(\lambda), L(\lambda) \otimes F\bigr)$, where U is $U(\mathfrak{g})$ (resp. $\check{U}_q\mathfrak{g}$), and F is the algebra of (quantized) regular functions on the connected simply connected algebraic group G corresponding to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. In other words, F is spanned by matrix elements of finite dimensional representations of U with an appropriate multiplication.

One more presentation of the algebra $\big(\operatorname{End} L(\lambda)\big)_{\text{fin}}$ comes from the fact that $\operatorname{Hom}_U\big(L(\lambda), L(\lambda) \otimes F\big)$ is isomorphic as a vector space to a certain subspace F' of F. The subspace F' can be equipped with a $\star$-multiplication obtained from the multiplication on F by applying the so-called reduced fusion element. Then $\big(\operatorname{End} L(\lambda)\big)_{\text{fin}}$ is isomorphic as an algebra to F' with this new multiplication. For certain values of λ, the same $\star$-multiplication on F' can be defined by applying the universal fusion element, that yields the affirmative answer to Kostant's problem in such cases.

More exactly, consider the triangular decomposition $U = U^- U^0 U^+$. We have $L(\lambda) = M(\lambda)/K_\lambda \mathbf{1}_\lambda$, where $M(\lambda)$ is the corresponding Verma module, $\mathbf{1}_\lambda$ is the generator of $M(\lambda)$, and $K_\lambda \subset U^-$. Consider also the opposite Verma module $\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)$ with the lowest weight $-\lambda$ and the lowest weight vector $\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda}$. Then its maximal U-submodule is of the form $\widetilde{K}_\lambda \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda}$, where $\widetilde{K}_\lambda \subset U^+$. We have $F' = F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$ — the subspace of U^0-invariant elements of F annihilated by both K_λ and $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$. The $\star$-product on $F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$ has the form

$$f_1 \star_\lambda f_2 = \mu \left(J^{\text{red}}(\lambda)(f_1 \otimes f_2) \right),$$

where μ is the multiplication on F, and the reduced fusion element $J^{\text{red}}(\lambda) \in U^- \mathbin{\widehat{\otimes}} U^+$ is computed in terms of the Shapovalov form on $L(\lambda)$. Notice that for generic λ the element $J^{\text{red}}(\lambda)$ is equal up to an U^0-part to the fusion element related to the Verma module $M(\lambda)$, see for example [1].

We also investigate limiting properties of $J(\lambda)$. In particular, for some values of λ_0 we can guarantee that $f_1 \star_\lambda f_2 \to f_1 \star_{\lambda_0} f_2$ as $\lambda \to \lambda_0$. Also, for any λ_0 having a "regularity property" of this kind, the action map $U \to (\operatorname{End} L(\lambda_0))_{\text{fin}}$ is surjective. This gives the affirmative answer to the (quantum version of) Kostant's problem.

For some values of λ, the subspace $F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$ is a subalgebra of $F[0]$, and can be considered as (a flat deformation of) the algebra of regular functions on some Poisson homogeneous space G/G_1. In those cases, the algebra $\big(F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}, \star_\lambda\big)$ is an equivariant quantization of the Poisson algebra of regular functions on G/G_1.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the definition of the version of quantized universal enveloping algebra used in this paper, and some related constructions that will be useful in the sequel. Section 3 is the core of the paper. We provide there a construction of a star-product on $F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$ in terms of the Shapovalov form on $L(\lambda)$. Finally, in Section 4 we study limiting properties of fusion elements and the corresponding star-products.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Maria Gorelik, Jiang-Hua Lu, and Catharina Stroppel for useful discussions on the topic of the paper.

2 Algebra $\check{U}_q\mathfrak{g}$

Let $\Bbbk$ be the field extension of $\mathbb{C}(q)$ by all fractional powers $q^{1/n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$. We use $\Bbbk$ as the ground field.

Let (a_{ij}) a finite type $r \times r$ Cartan matrix. Let d_i be relatively prime positive integers such that $d_i a_{ij} = d_j a_{ji}$. For any positive integer k, define

$$[k]_i = \frac{q^{kd_i} - q^{-kd_i}}{q^{d_i} - q^{-d_i}}\,, \qquad [k]_i! = [1]_i\,[2]_i\,\ldots\,[k]_i\,.$$

The algebra $U = \check{U}_q\mathfrak{g}$ is generated by the elements t_i, t_i^{-1}, e_i, f_i, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, subject to the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
&t_i t_i^{-1} = t_i^{-1} t_i = 1\,,\\
&t_i e_j t_i^{-1} = q^{d_i \delta_{ij}} e_j,\\
&t_i f_j t_i^{-1} = q^{-d_i \delta_{ij}} f_j,\\
&e_i f_j - f_j e_i = \delta_{ij}\,\frac{k_i - k_i^{-1}}{q^{d_i} - q^{-d_i}}, \text{ where } k_i = \prod_{j=1}^{r} t_j^{a_{ij}},\\
&\sum_{m=0}^{1-a_{ij}} \frac{(-1)^m}{[m]_i!\,[1-a_{ij}-m]_i!} e_i^k e_j e_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j,\\
&\sum_{m=0}^{1-a_{ij}} \frac{(-1)^m}{[m]_i!\,[1-a_{ij}-m]_i!} f_i^k f_j f_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $k_i e_j k_i^{-1} = q^{d_i a_{ij}} e_j$, $k_i f_j k_i^{-1} = q^{-d_i a_{ij}} f_j$.

The algebra U is a Hopf algebra with the comultiplication Δ, the counit ε, and the antipode σ given by

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\Delta(t_i) = t_i \otimes t_i, & \varepsilon(t_i) = 1, & \sigma(t_i) = t_i^{-1}\\
\Delta(e_i) = e_i \otimes 1 + k_i \otimes e_i, & \varepsilon(e_i) = 0, & \sigma(e_i) = -k_i^{-1} e_i\\
\Delta(f_i) = f_i \otimes k_i^{-1} + 1 \otimes f_i, & \varepsilon(f_i) = 0, & \sigma(f_i) = -f_i k_i.
\end{array}$$

In what follows we will sometimes use the Sweedler notation for comultiplication.

Let U^0 be the subalgebra of U generated by the elements $t_1, \ldots, t_r$, $t_1^{-1}, \ldots$, t_r^{-1}. Let U^+ and U^- be the subalgebras generated respectively by the elements $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ and $f_1, \ldots, f_r$. We have a triangular decomposition $U = U^- U^0 U^+$.

Denote by θ the involutive automorphism of U given by $\theta(e_i) = -f_i$, $\theta(f_i) = -e_i$, $\theta(t_i) = t_i^{-1}$. Notice that θ gives an algebra isomorphism $U^- \to U^+$. Set $\omega = \sigma\theta$, i.e., ω is the involutive antiautomorphism of U given by $\omega(e_i) = f_i k_i$, $\omega(f_i) = k_i^{-1} e_i$, $\omega(t_i) = t_i$.

Let $(\mathfrak{h}, \Pi, \Pi^\vee)$ be a realization of (a_{ij}) over $\mathbb{Q}$, that is, $\mathfrak{h}$ is (a rational form of) a Cartan subalgebra of the corresponding semisimple Lie algebra, $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r\} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ the set of simple roots, $\Pi^\vee = \{\alpha_1^\vee, \ldots, \alpha_r^\vee\} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ the set of simple coroots. Let $\mathbf{R}$ be the root system, $\mathbf{R}_+$ the set of positive roots, and W the Weyl group. Denote by $s_\alpha \in W$ the reflection corresponding to a root α. For $w \in W$, $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we set $w \cdot \lambda = w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_l \in \mathfrak{h}$ be the simple coweights, i.e., $\langle \alpha_i, u_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$. We denote by ρ the half sum of the positive roots. For $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we set $w \cdot \lambda = w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$.

Let

$$Q_+ = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathbb{Z}_+ \alpha \,.$$

For $\beta = \sum_j c_j \alpha_j \in Q_+$, denote $\operatorname{ht} \beta = \sum_j c_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we set $\lambda \geq \mu$ iff $\lambda - \mu \in Q_+$.

Take an invariant scalar product $(\,\cdot\,|\,\cdot\,)$ on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $(\alpha|\alpha) = 2$ for any short root α. Then $d_i = \frac{(\alpha_i|\alpha_i)}{2}$.

Denote by T the multiplicative subgroup generated by $t_1, \ldots, t_r$. Any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ defines a character $\Lambda : T \to \Bbbk$ given by $t_i \mapsto q^{d_i \langle \lambda, u_i \rangle}$. We will write $\Lambda = q^\lambda$. Notice that $q^\lambda(k_i) = q^{d_i \langle \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle}$. We extend q^λ to the subalgebra U^0 by linearity. We say that an element $x \in U$ is of weight λ if $txt^{-1} = q^\lambda(t) x$ for all $t \in T$.

For a U-module V, we denote by

$$V[\lambda] = \{v \in V \,|\, tv = q^\lambda(t) v \text{ for all } t \in T\}$$

the weight subspace of weight λ. We call the module V admissible if V is a direct sum of finite-dimensional weight subspaces $V[\lambda]$.

The Verma module $M(\lambda)$ over U with highest weight λ and highest weight vector $\mathbf{1}_\lambda$ is defined in the standard way:

$$M(\lambda) = U^- \mathbf{1}_\lambda, \qquad U^+ \mathbf{1}_\lambda = 0, \qquad t\mathbf{1}_\lambda = q^\lambda(t) \mathbf{1}_\lambda, \quad t \in T.$$

The map $U^- \to M(\lambda)$, $y \mapsto y\mathbf{1}_\lambda$ is an isomorphism of U^--modules.

Set $U_+^\pm = \operatorname{Ker} \varepsilon|_{U^\pm}$ and denote by $x \mapsto (x)_0$ the projection $U \to U^0$ along $U_+^- \cdot U + U \cdot U_+^+$. For any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ consider $\pi_\lambda : U^+ \otimes U^- \to \Bbbk$, $\pi_\lambda(x \otimes y) = q^\lambda((\sigma(x) y)_0)$, and $\mathbb{S}_\lambda : U^- \otimes U^- \to \Bbbk$, $\mathbb{S}_\lambda(x \otimes y) = \pi_\lambda(\theta(x) \otimes y) = q^\lambda((\omega(x) y)_0)$. We call $\mathbb{S}_\lambda$ the Shapovalov form on U^- corresponding to λ. We can regard $\mathbb{S}_\lambda$ as a bilinear form on $M(\lambda)$.

Set

$$K_\lambda = \{y \in U^- \,|\, \pi_\lambda(x \otimes y) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in U^+\},$$

$$\widetilde{K}_\lambda = \{x \in U^+ \mid \pi_\lambda(x \otimes y) = 0 \text{ for all } y \in U^-\}.$$

Clearly, K_λ is the kernel of $\mathbb{S}_\lambda$, $\widetilde{K}_\lambda = \theta(K_\lambda)$. Notice that $K(\lambda) = K_\lambda \cdot \mathbf{1}_\lambda$ is the largest proper submodule of $M(\lambda)$, and $L(\lambda) = M(\lambda)/K(\lambda)$ is the irreducible U-module with highest weight λ. Denote by $\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda$ the image of $\mathbf{1}_\lambda$ in $L(\lambda)$.

The following propositions are well known for the Lie-algebraic case. They also hold for the case of $U = \check{U}_q\mathfrak{g}$. Proposition 1 follows from a simple $U_q\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ computation. For Propositions 2, 3, 4, see [5].

Proposition 1. *Assume that $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfies $\langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = n \in \mathbb{N}$ for a simple root α_i. Then f_i^n is in K_λ.*

Proposition 2. *Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be dominant integral. Then the U-module $L(\lambda)$ is finite dimensional, and $\dim\big(L(\lambda)\big)[\mu] = \dim\big(L(\lambda)\big)[w\mu]$ for any $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $w \in W$.*

Proposition 3. *Assume that $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfies $\langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle = n \in \mathbb{N}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}_+$ and $\langle \lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{N}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbf{R}_+ \setminus \{\alpha\}$. Then K_λ is generated by a single element of weight $-n\alpha$.*

Proposition 4. *Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be dominant integral, $\langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = n_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Then K_λ is generated by the elements $f_i^{n_i}$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$.*

In the sequel we need some properties of the universal R-matrix of U. Namely, let V_1, V_2 be U-modules such that V_1 is a direct sum of highest weight modules or V_2 is a direct sum of lowest weight modules. Then the R-matrix induces an isomorphism $\check{R} : V_1 \otimes V_2 \to V_2 \otimes V_1$ of U-modules. Moreover, if V_1 is a highest weight module with highest weight λ and highest weight vector $\mathbf{1}_\lambda$, and V_2 is a lowest weight module with lowest weight μ and lowest weight vector $\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_\mu$, then $\check{R}(\mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_\mu) = q^{-(\lambda|\mu)}\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_\mu \otimes \mathbf{1}_\lambda$.

Let $F = \Bbbk[G]_q$ be the quantized algebra of regular functions on a connected simply connected algebraic group G that corresponds to the Cartan matrix (a_{ij}) (see [5, 9]). We can consider F as a Hopf subalgebra in the dual Hopf algebra $U^\star$. We will use the left and right regular actions of U on F defined respectively by the formulae $(\overrightarrow{a} f)(x) = f(xa)$ and $(f \overleftarrow{a})(x) = f(ax)$. Notice that F is a sum of finite-dimensional admissible U-modules with respect to both regular actions of U (see [9]).

3 Star products and fusion elements

3.1 Algebra of intertwining operators

Let us denote by $U_{\text{fin}} \subset U$ the subalgebra of locally finite elements with respect to the right adjoint action of U on itself. We will use similar notation for any (right) U-module.

For any (left) U-module M we equip F with the left regular U-action and consider the space $\operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F)$. For any $\varphi, \psi \in \operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F)$ define

$$\varphi * \psi = (\operatorname{id}\otimes\mu)\circ(\varphi\otimes\operatorname{id})\circ\psi, \tag{1}$$

where μ is the multiplication in F. We have $\varphi*\psi \in \operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F)$, and this definition equips $\operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F)$ with a unital associative algebra structure.

Consider the map $\Phi : \operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F) \to \operatorname{End} M$, $\varphi \mapsto u_\varphi$, defined by $u_\varphi(m) = (\operatorname{id}\otimes\varepsilon)(\varphi(m))$; here $\varepsilon(f) = f(1)$ is the counit in F. Consider U_{fin}, $\operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F)$ and $\operatorname{End} M$ as right U-module algebras: U_{fin} via right adjoint action, $\operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F)$ via right regular action on F (i.e., $(\varphi\cdot a)(m) = (\operatorname{id}\otimes\overleftarrow{a})(\varphi(m))$), and $\operatorname{End} M$ in a standard way (i.e., $u\cdot a = \sum_{(a)}\sigma(a_{(1)})_M u {a_{(2)}}_M$). Then $\operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F)_{\mathrm{fin}} = \operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F)$, and $\Phi : \operatorname{Hom}_U(M, M\otimes F) \longrightarrow (\operatorname{End} M)_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is an isomorphism of right U-module algebras (see [8, Proposition 6]).

Now we apply this to $M = M(\lambda)$ and $M = L(\lambda)$. Since $U_{\mathrm{fin}} \to (\operatorname{End} M(\lambda))_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is surjective (see [5, 6]), we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\operatorname{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), M(\lambda)\otimes F) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\Phi_{M(\lambda)}"] & \operatorname{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda)\otimes F) \arrow[d, "\Phi_{L(\lambda)}"] \\
(\operatorname{End} M(\lambda))_{\mathrm{fin}} \arrow[r] & (\operatorname{End} L(\lambda))_{\mathrm{fin}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

(see [8, Proposition 9]).

For any $\varphi \in \operatorname{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda)\otimes F)$ the formula $\varphi(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) = \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda\otimes f_\varphi + \sum_{\mu<\lambda} v_\mu\otimes f_\mu$, where v_μ is of weight μ, defines a map $\Theta : \operatorname{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda)\otimes F) \to F[0]$, $\varphi \mapsto f_\varphi$.

Theorem 5. *Θ is an embedding, and its image equals $F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$.*

To prove Theorem 5 we need some preparations.

In the sequel V stands for an U-module which is a direct sum of finite dimensional admissible U-modules.

For an admissible U-module M we will denote by M^* its restricted dual.

Let $\widetilde{M}(\lambda)$ be the “opposite Verma module” with the lowest weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and the lowest weight vector $\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda$. It is clear that $\widetilde{K}_{-\lambda}\cdot\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda$ is the largest proper submodule in $\widetilde{M}(\lambda)$.

Lemma 6. $\operatorname{Hom}_{U^-}(M(\lambda), V) = (V\otimes M(\lambda)^*)^{U^-}$, $\operatorname{Hom}_{U^+}(\widetilde{M}(\lambda), V) = (V\otimes \widetilde{M}(\lambda)^*)^{U^+}$.

Proof. For any $\varphi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{U^-}(M(\lambda), V)$ the image of φ is equal to the finite-dimensional U^--submodule $U^-\varphi(\mathbf{1}_\lambda)$. Therefore for any $x \in U^-$ such that $x\mathbf{1}_\lambda$ is a weight vector whose weight is large enough we have $\varphi(x\mathbf{1}_\lambda) = x\varphi(\mathbf{1}_\lambda) = 0$. Thus φ corresponds to an element in $(V\otimes M(\lambda)^*)^{U^-}$.

The second part of the lemma can be proved similarly. □

Choose vectors $\mathbf{1}^*_\lambda \in M(\lambda)^*[-\lambda]$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}^*_{-\lambda} \in \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*[\lambda]$ such that $\langle \mathbf{1}^*_\lambda, \mathbf{1}_\lambda \rangle = \langle \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}^*_{-\lambda}, \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda} \rangle = 1$. Define maps $\zeta : \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*) \to V[0]$ and $\widetilde{\zeta} : \mathrm{Hom}_U(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V \otimes M(\lambda)^*) \to V[0]$ by the formulae $\varphi(\mathbf{1}_\lambda) = \zeta_\varphi \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}^*_{-\lambda} +$ lower order terms, $\varphi(\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda}) = \widetilde{\zeta}_\varphi \otimes \mathbf{1}^*_\lambda +$ higher order terms.

Consider also the natural maps

$$\begin{aligned} r &: \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda) \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V) \to \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*), \\ \widetilde{r} &: \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda) \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V) \to \mathrm{Hom}_U(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V \otimes M(\lambda)^*). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 7. *Maps ζ, $\widetilde{\zeta}$, r, and $\widetilde{r}$ are vector space isomorphisms, and the diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda) \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V) \arrow[r, "r"] \arrow[d, "\check{R}^{-1}"] & \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*) \arrow[r, "\zeta"] & V[0] \arrow[d, "q^{-(\lambda|\lambda)}"] \\ \mathrm{Hom}_U(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda) \otimes M(\lambda), V) \arrow[r, "\widetilde{r}"] & \mathrm{Hom}_U(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V \otimes M(\lambda)^*) \arrow[r, "\widetilde{\zeta}"] & V[0] \end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative.

Proof. First of all notice that we have the natural identification

$$\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*) = (V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*)^{U^+}[\lambda],$$

Further on, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda) \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V) = \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), \mathrm{Hom}(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V)) = \\ &\mathrm{Hom}_{U^+}(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V)[\lambda] = V[0]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other side, $\mathrm{Hom}_{U^+}(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V) = (V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*)^{U^+}$ by Lemma 6. Now it is clear that the map r (resp. ζ) corresponds to the identification $\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda) \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V) = (V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*)^{U^+}[\lambda]$ (resp. $(V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*)^{U^+}[\lambda] = V[0]$).

The second part of the proposition concerning $\widetilde{r}$ and $\widetilde{\zeta}$ can be verified similarly.

Finally, since $\check{R}^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda} \otimes \mathbf{1}_\lambda) = q^{-(\lambda|\lambda)} \mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda}$, the whole diagram is commutative. □

Now note that the pairing $\pi_\lambda : U^+ \otimes U^- \to \Bbbk$ naturally defines a pairing $\widetilde{M}(-\lambda) \otimes M(\lambda) \to \Bbbk$. Denote by $\chi_\lambda : M(\lambda) \to \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*$ the corresponding morphism of U-modules. The kernel of χ_λ is equal to $K(\lambda) = K_\lambda \cdot \mathbf{1}_\lambda$, and the image of χ_λ is $(\widetilde{K}_\lambda \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})^\perp \simeq L(\lambda)$. Therefore χ_λ can be naturally represented as $\chi''_\lambda \circ \chi'_\lambda$, where

$$M(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\chi'_\lambda} L(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\chi''_\lambda} \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*.$$

The morphisms χ'_λ and χ''_λ induce the commutative diagram of embeddings

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), V\otimes L(\lambda)) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V\otimes L(\lambda)) \arrow[d] \\
\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), V\otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V\otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*).
\end{tikzcd}$$

It is clear that the following lemma holds:

Lemma 8. *The image of* $\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), V\otimes L(\lambda))$ *in* $\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V\otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*)$ *under the embedding above consists of the morphisms* $\varphi : M(\lambda) \to V\otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*$ *such that* $\varphi(K_\lambda \mathbf{1}_\lambda) = 0$ *and* $\varphi(M(\lambda)) \subset V\otimes (\widetilde{K}_\lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})^\perp$. ☐

Proposition 9. *Let* $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V\otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*)$. *Then* $\varphi(M(\lambda)) \subset V\otimes (\widetilde{K}_\lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})^\perp$ *iff* $\widetilde{K}_\lambda \zeta_\varphi = 0$.

Proof. First notice that $\varphi(M(\lambda)) \subset V\otimes(\widetilde{K}_\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})^\perp$ iff $\varphi(\mathbf{1}_\lambda) \in V\otimes(\widetilde{K}_\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})^\perp$. Indeed, for any $x\in U$ we have $\varphi(x\mathbf{1}_\lambda) = \sum_{(x)}(x_{(1)}\otimes x_{(2)})\varphi(\mathbf{1}_\lambda)$ and $U\cdot(\widetilde{K}_\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})^\perp = (\widetilde{K}_\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})^\perp$.

Denote by ψ the element in $\mathrm{Hom}_{U^+}(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V)$ that corresponds to $\varphi(\mathbf{1}_\lambda) \in (V\otimes\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*)^{U^+}$ (see Lemma 6). Under this notation $\varphi(\mathbf{1}_\lambda) \in V\otimes(\widetilde{K}_\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})^\perp$ iff $\psi(\widetilde{K}_\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda}) = 0$. On the other hand, $\zeta_\varphi = \psi(\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda})$ and $\psi(\widetilde{K}_\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda}) = \widetilde{K}_\lambda\psi(\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}_{-\lambda}) = \widetilde{K}_\lambda\zeta_\varphi$. This completes the proof. ☐

Proposition 10. *Let* $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V\otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*)$. *Then* $\varphi(K_\lambda\mathbf{1}_\lambda) = 0$ *iff* $K_\lambda\zeta_\varphi = 0$.

Proof. Consider $\widehat{\varphi} = r^{-1}(\varphi) \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda)\otimes\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V)$, $\overline{\varphi} = \widehat{\varphi}\circ\check{R}^{-1} \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)\otimes M(\lambda), V)$, and $\widetilde{\varphi} = \widetilde{r}(\overline{\varphi}) \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda), V\otimes M(\lambda)^*)$ (see Proposition 7). Since $K_\lambda\mathbf{1}_\lambda\otimes\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)$ is an $U\otimes U$-submodule in $M(\lambda)\otimes\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)$, one has $\varphi(K_\lambda\mathbf{1}_\lambda) = 0$ iff $\widehat{\varphi}(K_\lambda\mathbf{1}_\lambda\otimes\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)) = 0$ iff $\overline{\varphi}(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)\otimes K_\lambda\mathbf{1}_\lambda) = 0$ iff $\widetilde{\varphi}(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)) \subset V\otimes(K_\lambda\mathbf{1}_\lambda)^\perp$.

Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 9 we see that $\widetilde{\varphi}(\widetilde{M}(-\lambda)) \subset V\otimes(K_\lambda\mathbf{1}_\lambda)^\perp$ iff $K_\lambda\widetilde{\zeta}_{\widetilde{\varphi}} = 0$. Now it is enough to notice that $\widetilde{\zeta}_{\widetilde{\varphi}} = q^{-(\lambda|\lambda)}\zeta_\varphi$ by Proposition 7, and therefore $K_\lambda\widetilde{\zeta}_{\widetilde{\varphi}} = 0$ iff $K_\lambda\zeta_\varphi = 0$. ☐

Define maps $u : \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda)\otimes V) \to V[0]$ and $v : \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), V\otimes L(\lambda)) \to V[0]$ via $\varphi \mapsto u_\varphi$, where $\varphi(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) = \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda \otimes u_\varphi +$ lower order terms, and $\psi \mapsto v_\psi$, where $\psi(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) = v_\psi\otimes\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda +$ lower order terms.

Proposition 11. *The map* v *defines the isomorphism* $\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), V\otimes L(\lambda)) \simeq V[0]^{K_\lambda+\widetilde{K}_\lambda}$.

Proof. Observe that v can be decomposed as

$$\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), V \otimes L(\lambda)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda), V \otimes \widetilde{M}(-\lambda)^*) \xrightarrow{\zeta} V[0],$$

where the first arrow is the natural embedding considered in Lemma 8. Now it is enough to apply the above mentioned lemma and Propositions 9 and 10. ☐

Proposition 12. *The diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), V \otimes L(\lambda)) \arrow[r, "v"] \arrow[d, "\check{R}"] & V[0] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}"] \\
\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda) \otimes V) \arrow[r, "u"] & V[0]
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative.

Proof. Take $\psi \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), V \otimes L(\lambda))$ and $\varphi = \check{R} \circ \psi \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda) \otimes V)$. Since v_ψ is of weight 0, we have $\varphi(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) = \check{R}\psi(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) = \check{R}(v_\psi \otimes \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) +$ lower order terms $= v_\psi \otimes \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda +$ lower order terms. ☐

Applying Propositions 11 and 12 to the case $V = F$ we get Theorem 5.

3.2 Reduced fusion elements

In this subsection we describe $\Theta^{-1} : F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda} \to \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda) \otimes F)$ explicitly. We are going to obtain a formula for Θ^{-1} in terms of the Shapovalov form. Recall that we can regard $\mathbb{S}_\lambda$ as a bilinear form on $M(\lambda)$. Denote by $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda$ the corresponding bilinear form on $L(\lambda)$. For any $\beta \in Q_+$ denote by $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda^\beta$ the restriction of $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda$ to $L(\lambda)[\lambda - \beta]$. Let $y_\beta^i \cdot \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda$ be an arbitrary basis in $L(\lambda)[\lambda - \beta]$, where $y_\beta^i \in U^-[-\beta]$.

Take $f \in F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$ and set $\varphi = \Theta^{-1}(f)$,

$$\varphi(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_i y_\beta^i \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda \otimes f^{\beta,i}.$$

Remark 1. For $\beta = 0$ we have $y_\beta^i = 1$ and $f^{\beta,i} = f$.

Proposition 13. $f^{\beta,i} = \sum_j \left(\overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda^\beta\right)^{-1}_{ij} \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y_\beta^j\right)} f$.

Proof. For any $\beta = \sum_j c_j \alpha_j \in Q_+$ set $k_\beta = \prod_j k_j^{c_j} \in T$ and $\Lambda_\beta = q^\lambda(k_\beta) = \prod_j q^{d_j c_j \langle \lambda, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle}$.

Set $\xi = \varphi(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda)$. Clearly, ξ is a singular element in $L(\lambda) \otimes F$. In particular, $(k_i \otimes k_i)\xi = q^{d_i \langle \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle}\xi$ and $(e_i \otimes 1 + k_i \otimes e_i)\xi = 0$. Thus $(e_i \otimes 1)\xi = q^{d_i \langle \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle}(1 \otimes \sigma^{-1}(e_i))\xi$. By induction we get $(x \otimes 1)\xi = \Lambda_\beta(1 \otimes \sigma^{-1}(x))\xi$ for any $x \in U^+[\beta]$.

Let ω' be the involutive antiautomorphism of U given by $\omega'(e_i) = f_i$, $\omega'(f_i) = e_i$, $\omega'(t_i) = t_i$. Set $x_\beta^j = \omega'(y_\beta^j)$. Then we have

$$\left(\overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda \otimes \mathrm{id}\right)\left(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda \otimes \left(x_\beta^j \otimes 1\right)\xi\right) = \Lambda_\beta \left(\overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda \otimes \mathrm{id}\right)\left(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda \otimes \left(1 \otimes \sigma^{-1}\left(x_\beta^j\right)\right)\xi\right). \tag{2}$$

It is easy to show by induction on $\operatorname{ht}\beta$ that $\omega(x_\beta^j) = q^{c(\beta)} y_\beta^j k_\beta$ and $\sigma^{-1}(x_\beta^j) = q^{c(\beta)}\theta(y_\beta^j)k_\beta^{-1}$ for a certain $c(\beta)$. (Actually $c(\beta) = d_1 + \ldots + d_l - \frac{1}{2}\langle \beta, d_1\alpha_1^\vee + \ldots + d_l\alpha_l^\vee\rangle$.) Hence the l. h. s. of (2) equals

$$\sum_i \overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda\left(\omega\left(x_\beta^j\right)\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda, y_\beta^i \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda\right) f^{\beta,i} = q^{c(\beta)}\Lambda_\beta \sum_i \overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda\left(y_\beta^j \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda, y_\beta^i \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda\right) f^{\beta,i}$$

and the r. h. s. of (2) equals

$$\Lambda_\beta \overrightarrow{\sigma^{-1}\left(x_\beta^j\right)} f = q^{c(\beta)}\Lambda_\beta \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y_\beta^j\right)} f.$$

Combining these together we get

$$\sum_i \overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda\left(y_\beta^j \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda, y_\beta^i \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda\right) f^{\beta,i} = \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y_\beta^j\right)} f,$$

and the proposition follows. □

For any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ consider

$$J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda) = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_{i,j} \left(\overline{\mathbb{S}}_\lambda^\beta\right)_{ij}^{-1} y_\beta^i \otimes \theta\left(y_\beta^j\right). \tag{3}$$

One can regard $J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda)$ as an element in a certain completion of $U^- \otimes U^+$.

Remark 2. This element $J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda)$ is not uniquely defined (e.g., because $U^- \to L(\lambda)$ has a kernel), but this does not affect our further considerations.

Remark 3. For $f \in F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$ and $\varphi = \Theta^{-1}(f)$ one has $\varphi(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) = J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda)(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda \otimes f)$.

Let us define an associative product $\star_\lambda$ on $F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$ by means of Θ, i.e., for any $f_1, f_2 \in F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}$ we define $f_1 \star_\lambda f_2 = \Theta(\varphi_1 * \varphi_2)$, where $\varphi_1 = \Theta^{-1}(f_1)$, $\varphi_2 = \Theta^{-1}(f_2)$, and $*$ is the product on $\operatorname{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda) \otimes F)$ given by (1). By this definition, we get a right U-module algebra $(F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}, \star_\lambda)$.

Theorem 14. *We have*

$$f_1 \star_\lambda f_2 = \mu\left(\overrightarrow{J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda)}(f_1 \otimes f_2)\right). \tag{4}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&(\varphi_1 * \varphi_2)(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) = (\mathrm{id} \otimes \mu)(\varphi_1 \otimes \mathrm{id})(\varphi_2(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda)) = \\ &(\mathrm{id} \otimes \mu)(\varphi_1 \otimes \mathrm{id}) \left(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda \otimes f_2 + \sum_{\beta \in Q_+ \setminus \{0\}} \sum_i y_\beta^i \cdot \overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda \otimes f_2^{\beta,i} \right) = \\ &(\mathrm{id} \otimes \mu) \left(\varphi_1(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda) \otimes f_2 + \sum_{\beta \in Q_+ \setminus \{0\}} \sum_i (\Delta(y_\beta^i)\varphi_1(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda)) \otimes f_2^{\beta,i} \right) = \\ &\overline{\mathbf{1}}_\lambda \otimes \left(f_1 f_2 + \sum_{\beta \in Q_+ \setminus \{0\}} \sum_i \left(\overrightarrow{y_\beta^i} f_1 \right) f_2^{\beta,i} \right) + \text{lower order terms,}\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equation we use the fact that for any $y \in U_+^-$ we have $\Delta(y) = 1 \otimes y + \sum_k y_k \otimes z_k$ with $y_k \in U_+^-$. Therefore

$$f_1 \star_\lambda f_2 = f_1 f_2 + \sum_{\beta \in Q_+ \setminus \{0\}} \sum_i \left(\overrightarrow{y_\beta^i} f_1 \right) f_2^{\beta,i} = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_i \left(\overrightarrow{y_\beta^i} f_1 \right) f_2^{\beta,i}.$$

To finish the proof it is enough to apply Proposition 13 to f_2. □

Remark 4. Theorem 14 together with results of [8] implies that the algebras $\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda), L(\lambda) \otimes F)$, $(\mathrm{End}\, L(\lambda))_{\mathrm{fin}}$, and $\left(F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda}, \star_\lambda\right)$ are isomorphic as right Hopf module algebras over U.

4 Limiting properties of the fusion element

We say that $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is *generic* if $\langle \lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{N}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbf{R}_+$. In this case $L(\lambda) = M(\lambda)$, and we set $J(\lambda) = J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda)$. Notice that $J(\lambda)$ up to a U^0-part equals the fusion element related to the Verma module $M(\lambda)$ (see, e.g., [1]).

4.1 Regularity

Let $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Since $J(\lambda)$ is invariant w. r. to $\tau(\theta \otimes \theta)$ (where τ is the tensor permutation), one can easily see that the following conditions on λ_0 are equivalent: 1) for any U^--module M the family of operators $J(\lambda)^M : M \otimes F[0]^{\widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}} \to M \otimes F$ naturally defined by $J(\lambda)$ is regular at $\lambda = \lambda_0$, 2) for any U^+-module N the family of operators $J(\lambda)_N : F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0}} \otimes N \to F \otimes N$ naturally defined by $J(\lambda)$ is regular at $\lambda = \lambda_0$. We will say that λ_0 is *J-regular* if these conditions are satisfied. Clearly, any generic λ_0 is J-regular.

Proposition 15. *Assume that* $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *is* J*-regular. Then* $F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0}} = F[0]^{\widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}} = F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0} + \widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}}$.

Proof. Let $g \in F[0]^{\widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}}$. If $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is generic, then the element $J(\lambda)^{M(\lambda)}(\mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes g)$ is a singular vector of weight λ in $M(\lambda) \otimes F$. Therefore $Z := \lim_{\lambda \to \lambda_0} J(\lambda)^{M(\lambda)}(\mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes g)$ is a singular vector of weight λ_0 in $M(\lambda_0) \otimes F$, and hence we have $\varphi_Z \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda_0), M(\lambda_0) \otimes F)$, $\varphi_Z(\mathbf{1}_{\lambda_0}) = Z$.

Under the natural map $\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda_0), M(\lambda_0) \otimes F) \to \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda_0), L(\lambda_0) \otimes F)$ we have $\varphi_Z \mapsto \varphi_{\overline{Z}}$, where $\varphi_{\overline{Z}}(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_{\lambda_0}) = \overline{Z} =$ the projection of Z onto $L(\lambda_0) \otimes F$. Now notice that $g = \Theta(\varphi_{\overline{Z}}) \in F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0} + \widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}}$.

The proof of $F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0}} = F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0} + \widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}}$ is similar. ☐

Proposition 16. *Assume that* $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *is* J*-regular. Then the natural map* $\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda_0), M(\lambda_0) \otimes F) \to \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda_0), L(\lambda_0) \otimes F)$ *is surjective.*

Proof. We have the isomorphism

$$\Theta : \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda_0), L(\lambda_0) \otimes F) \to F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0} + \widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}} = F[0]^{\widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}}.$$

Now take $g \in F[0]^{\widetilde{K}_{\lambda_0}}$. Consider $Z = \lim_{\lambda \to \lambda_0} J(\lambda)^{M(\lambda)}(\mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes g) \in M(\lambda_0) \otimes F$. Since Z a singular vector of weight λ_0, we have $\varphi_Z \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda_0), M(\lambda_0) \otimes F)$, $\varphi_Z(\mathbf{1}_{\lambda_0}) = Z$. Clearly, under the mapping $\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda_0), M(\lambda_0) \otimes F) \to \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda_0), L(\lambda_0) \otimes F)$ the image of φ_Z equals to $\Theta^{-1}(g)$, which proves the proposition. ☐

Proposition 17. *Assume that* $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *is* J*-regular. Then the action map* $U_{\mathrm{fin}} \to (\mathrm{End}\, L(\lambda_0))_{\mathrm{fin}}$ *is surjective.*

Proof. Recall that we have the isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda_0), M(\lambda_0) \otimes F) \simeq (\mathrm{End}\, M(\lambda_0))_{\mathrm{fin}},$$
$$\mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda_0), L(\lambda_0) \otimes F) \simeq (\mathrm{End}\, L(\lambda_0))_{\mathrm{fin}}.$$

It is well known that the action map $U_{\mathrm{fin}} \to (\mathrm{End}\, M(\lambda_0))_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is surjective for any $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ (see [5, 6]). Since by Proposition 16 the map $(\mathrm{End}\, M(\lambda_0))_{\mathrm{fin}} \to (\mathrm{End}\, L(\lambda_0))_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is surjective, the map $U_{\mathrm{fin}} \to (\mathrm{End}\, L(\lambda_0))_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is also surjective. ☐

Proposition 18. *Assume that* $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *is* J*-regular. Then for any* $f, g \in F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0}}$ *we have* $\overrightarrow{J(\lambda)}(f \otimes g) \to \overrightarrow{J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda_0)}(f \otimes g)$ *as* $\lambda \to \lambda_0$.

Proof. For any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we may naturally identify $M(\lambda)$ with U^- as U^--modules. Therefore we know by definition of J-regularity that $J(\lambda)^{M(\lambda)}(\mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes g)$ is regular at $\lambda = \lambda_0$. Thus $J(\lambda)^{M(\lambda)}(\mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes g) \to Z \in M(\lambda_0) \otimes F$ as $\lambda \to \lambda_0$. In an arbitrary basis $y_\beta^i \in U^-[-\beta]$ we have

$$J(\lambda)^{M(\lambda)}(\mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes g) = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_{i,j} \left(\mathbb{S}_\lambda^\beta\right)_{ij}^{-1} y_\beta^i \mathbf{1}_\lambda \otimes \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y_\beta^j\right)} g,$$

and

$$Z = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_{i,j} a^{\beta}_{ij} \cdot y^i_{\beta} \mathbf{1}_{\lambda_0} \otimes \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y^j_{\beta}\right)} g$$

for some coefficients a^{β}_{ij}.

Now choose a basis $y^i_{\beta} \in U^-[-\beta]$ in the following way: first take a basis in $K_{\lambda_0}[-\beta] = K_{\lambda_0} \cap U^-[-\beta]$ and then extend it arbitrarily to a basis in the whole $U^-[-\beta]$. In this basis the projection $\overline{Z} \in L(\lambda_0) \otimes F$ of the element Z is given by

$$\overline{Z} = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_{y^i_{\beta}, y^j_{\beta} \notin K_{\lambda_0}[-\beta]} a^{\beta}_{ij} \cdot y^i_{\beta} \overline{\mathbf{1}}_{\lambda_0} \otimes \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y^j_{\beta}\right)} g. \tag{5}$$

Now notice that Z, being the limit of singular vectors of weight λ in $M(\lambda) \otimes F$, defines the intertwining operator $\varphi_Z \in \mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda_0), M(\lambda_0) \otimes F)$, $\varphi_Z(\mathbf{1}_{\lambda_0}) = Z$. Under the natural map $\mathrm{Hom}_U(M(\lambda_0), M(\lambda_0) \otimes F) \to \mathrm{Hom}_U(L(\lambda_0), L(\lambda_0) \otimes F)$ we have $\varphi_Z \mapsto \varphi_{\overline{Z}}$, where $\varphi_{\overline{Z}}(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_{\lambda_0}) = \overline{Z}$. Therefore $\overline{Z} = J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda_0)^{M(\lambda_0)}(\overline{\mathbf{1}}_{\lambda_0} \otimes g)$ by Proposition 13 and the definition of $J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda_0)$. Comparing this with (5) we conclude that for all i, j such that $y^i_{\beta}, y^j_{\beta} \notin K_{\lambda_0}[-\beta]$ we have $a^{\beta}_{ij} = \left(\overline{\mathbb{S}}^{\beta}_{\lambda_0}\right)^{-1}_{ij}$.

Finally,

$$\begin{gathered}
\overrightarrow{J(\lambda)}(f \otimes g) \to \sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_{i,j} a^{\beta}_{ij} \overrightarrow{y^i_{\beta}} f \otimes \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y^j_{\beta}\right)} g = \\
\sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_{y^i_{\beta}, y^j_{\beta} \notin K_{\lambda_0}[-\beta]} a^{\beta}_{ij} \overrightarrow{y^i_{\beta}} f \otimes \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y^j_{\beta}\right)} g = \\
\sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \sum_{y^i_{\beta}, y^j_{\beta} \notin K_{\lambda_0}[-\beta]} \left(\overline{\mathbb{S}}^{\beta}_{\lambda_0}\right)^{-1}_{ij} \overrightarrow{y^i_{\beta}} f \otimes \overrightarrow{\theta\left(y^j_{\beta}\right)} g = \overrightarrow{J^{\mathrm{red}}(\lambda_0)}(f \otimes g)
\end{gathered}$$

as $\lambda \to \lambda_0$. □

Corollary 19. *Assume that* $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *is* J*-regular. Let* $f_1, f_2 \in F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0}}$. *Then* $f_1 \star_{\lambda} f_2 \to f_1 \star_{\lambda_0} f_2$ *as* $\lambda \to \lambda_0$. □

4.2 One distinguished root case

Theorem 20. *Let* $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}_+$. *Consider* $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *that satisfies* $\langle \lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha^{\vee} \rangle = n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\langle \lambda_0 + \rho, \beta^{\vee} \rangle \notin \mathbb{N}$ *for all* $\beta \in \mathbf{R}_+ \setminus \{\alpha\}$. *Then* λ_0 *is* J*-regular.*

Proof. Fix an arbitrary line $l \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ through λ_0, $l = \{\lambda_0 + t\nu \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, transversal to the hyperplane $\langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^{\vee} \rangle = n$.

Identify $M(\lambda)$ with U^- in the standard way. Recall that we have a basis $y^i_{\beta} \in U^-[-\beta]$ for $\beta \in Q_+$. Let $L\left(\mathbb{S}^{\beta}_{\lambda}\right) \in \mathrm{End}\, U^-[-\beta]$ be given by the matrix $\left(\mathbb{S}^{\beta}_{\lambda}\right)_{ij}$

in the basis y^i_β. Notice that $\operatorname{Ker} L\left(\mathbb{S}^\beta_{\lambda_0}\right) = \operatorname{Ker}\mathbb{S}^\beta_{\lambda_0} = K_{\lambda_0}[-\beta] = K_{\lambda_0} \cap U^-[-\beta]$. For any $\lambda \in l$ sufficiently close to λ_0, $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$ we have $M(\lambda)$ is irreducible, and $L\left(\mathbb{S}^\beta_\lambda\right)$ is invertible for any $\beta \in Q_+$. In this notation we have

$$J(\lambda) = \sum_{\beta\in Q_+} \sum_j L\left(\mathbb{S}^\beta_\lambda\right)^{-1} y^j_\beta \otimes \theta\left(y^j_\beta\right).$$

Take $\lambda = \lambda_0 + t\nu \in l$. Fix any $\beta \in Q_+$ and set $V = U^-[-\beta]$, $A_t = L\left(\mathbb{S}^\beta_\lambda\right)$, $V_0 = \operatorname{Ker} A_0 = K_{\lambda_0}[-\beta] \subset V$. Write $A_t = A_0 + tB_t$, where B_t is regular at $t = 0$. Since $J(\lambda)$ may have at most simple poles (see, e.g., [2]) we have $A_t^{-1} = \frac{1}{t}C + D_t$, where D_t is regular at $t = 0$.

Lemma 21. *$\operatorname{Im} C \subset V_0$.*

Proof. We have $A_t A_t^{-1} = \mathrm{id}$ for any $t \neq 0$, i.e., $\frac{1}{t}A_0C + A_0D_t + B_tC + tB_tD_t = \mathrm{id}$. Since the left hand side should be regular at $t = 0$, we have $A_0C = 0$, which proves the lemma. □

For $t \neq 0$ set $J_t = \sum_j A_t^{-1} y_j \otimes \theta(y_j)$ (from now on we are omitting the index β for the sake of brevity). By Lemma 21 we have $Cy_j \in V_0 = K_{\lambda_0}[-\beta]$. Hence for $f \in F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0}}$ we have $\overrightarrow{Cy_j} f = 0$. Therefore $\overrightarrow{A_t^{-1}y_j} f = \frac{1}{t}\overrightarrow{Cy_j} f + \overrightarrow{D_t y_j} f = \overrightarrow{D_t y_j} f$. This proves the regularity of $(J_t)_N(f \otimes \cdot)$ at $t = 0$, i.e., the regularity of $J_q(\lambda)_N(f \otimes \cdot)$ at $\lambda = \lambda_0$. □

4.3 Subset of simple roots case

Theorem 22. *Let $\Gamma \subset \Pi$. Consider $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ that satisfies $\langle \lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $\alpha_i \in \Gamma$, $\langle \lambda_0 + \rho, \beta^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{N}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbf{R}_+ \setminus \operatorname{Span}\Gamma$. Then λ_0 is J-regular.*

Proof. Recall that the only singularities of $J(\lambda)$ near λ_0 are (simple) poles on the hyperplanes $\langle \lambda - \lambda_0, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$ for $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}_+ \cap \operatorname{Span}\Gamma$ (see, e.g., [2]). Therefore it is enough to show that for any $f \in F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0}}$ the operator $J(\lambda)_N(f \otimes \cdot)$ has no singularity at any such hyperplane.

Take $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}_+ \cap \operatorname{Span}\Gamma$ and consider a hyperplane $\langle \lambda - \lambda_0, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$. Take an arbitrary $\lambda' \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\langle \lambda' - \lambda_0, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$, and $\langle \lambda' + \rho, \beta^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{N}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbf{R}_+ \setminus \{\alpha\}$.

Lemma 23. *$K_{\lambda'} \subset K_{\lambda_0}$.*

Proof. First, assume that λ_0 is dominant integral, i.e., $\Gamma = \Pi$. Set $n = \langle \lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle$. Consider the irreducible U-module $L(\lambda_0)$ with a highest weight vector $\overline{\mathbf{1}}_{\lambda_0}$. The inclusion $K_{\lambda'} \subset K_{\lambda_0}$ is equivalent to the equality $K_{\lambda'}\overline{\mathbf{1}}_{\lambda_0} = 0$. By Proposition 3, $K_{\lambda'}$ is generated by an element $x_{\lambda'} \in U^-$ of weight $-n\alpha$. Hence the vector $x_{\lambda'}\overline{\mathbf{1}}_{\lambda_0}$ has weight $\lambda_0 - n\alpha$. Thus it suffices to show that $\lambda_0 - n\alpha$

is not a weight of $L(\lambda_0)$. Indeed, easy computations show that $s_\alpha(\lambda_0 - n\alpha) = \lambda_0 + \langle \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle \alpha > \lambda_0$, and since the set of weights of $L(\lambda_0)$ is W-invariant, the lemma is proved in this case.

Now, let us consider the general case. Let λ_0 be an arbitrary weight satisfying the assumptions of the theorem. Set $n_i = \langle \lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle$. Denote by K'_{λ_0} the right ideal in U^- generated by the elements $f_i^{n_i}$, $\alpha_i \in \Gamma$. By Proposition 1, we have $K'_{\lambda_0} \subset K_{\lambda_0}$.

Denote by $X(\lambda_0)$ the set of dominant integral weights μ such that $\langle \mu + \rho, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = n_i$ for all $\alpha_i \in \Gamma$. We have proved that $K_{\lambda'} \subset K_\mu$ for any $\mu \in X(\lambda_0)$. Thus $K_{\lambda'} \subset \bigcap_{\mu \in X(\lambda_0)} K_\mu$.

For $\mu \in X(\lambda_0)$, Proposition 4 yields that K_μ is generated by K'_{λ_0} and the elements $f_j^{\langle \mu + \rho, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle}$, $j \in \Pi \setminus \Gamma$. Notice that choosing $\mu \in X(\lambda_0)$, all the numbers $\langle \mu + \rho, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle$ can be made arbitrary large. Hence, $K'_{\lambda_0} = \bigcap_{\mu \in X(\lambda_0)} K_\mu$. Therefore, $K_{\lambda'} \subset K'_{\lambda_0} \subset K_{\lambda_0}$. The lemma is proved. ☐

The lemma implies that $F[0]^{K_{\lambda'}} \supset F[0]^{K_{\lambda_0}}$, and applying Theorem 20 to λ' we complete the proof of the theorem. ☐

Remark 5. In fact, it is possible to prove that if λ_0 satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 22, then K_{λ_0} is generated by the elements $f_i^{\langle \lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle}$, $\alpha_i \in \Gamma$. Indeed, this fact is well-known in the classical case $q = 1$, see [3]. Let us consider the highest weight module $V_q = M_q(\lambda_0)/K'_{\lambda_0}$ (we have used at this point the notation M_q for the Verma modules over $\check{U}_q\mathfrak{g}$). We have to prove that it is irreducible under assumptions of the theorem. If not, there exists some weight space $V_q[\mu]$ such that the determinant of the restriction of the Shapovalov form on V_q to $V_q[\mu]$ is zero. Let us denote the Shapovalov form on V_q by $\mathbb{S}_q$ and its restriction to $V_q[\mu]$ by $\mathbb{S}_q[\mu]$. Taking limit $q \to 1$ (it can be done in the same way as in [5, Sections 3.4.5–3.4.6] we see that $\mathbb{S}_q[\mu] \to \mathbb{S}_1[\mu]$ and $\det \mathbb{S}_q[\mu] \to \det \mathbb{S}_1[\mu]$. However, the latter determinant is non-zero because V_1 is irreducible. Hence, V_q is also irreducible.

4.4 Application to Poisson homogeneous spaces

Let $\Gamma \subset \Pi$. Assume that $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is such that $\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$, and $\langle \lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{N}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbf{R}_+ \setminus \operatorname{Span} \Gamma$. By Theorem 22, λ is J-regular. In particular, $F[0]^{K_\lambda + \widetilde{K}_\lambda} = F[0]^{K_\lambda}$.

In what follows it will be more convenient to write F_q, J_q, and $K_{q,\lambda}$ instead of F, J, and K_λ. We will also need the classical limits $F_1 = \lim_{q \to 1} F_q$ and $K_{1,\lambda} = \lim_{q \to 1} K_{q,\lambda}$. They can be defined in the same way as in [5, Sections 3.4.5–3.4.6].

Clearly, F_1 is the algebra of regular functions on the connected simply connected group G, whose Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathfrak{k}$ be a reductive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ which contains $\mathfrak{h}$ and is defined by Γ, K the corresponding subgroup of G, and $F(G/K)$

the algebra of regular functions on the homogeneous space G/K. According to [8, Theorem 33], we have $F(G/K) = F_1[0]^{K_{1,\lambda}}$. Therefore we get

Proposition 24. $\lim_{q\to 1} F_q[0]^{K_{q,\lambda}} = F(G/K)$. □

Furthermore, since $F_q[0]^{K_{q,\lambda}}$ is a Hopf module algebra over U, $F(G/K)$ is a Poisson homogeneous space over G equipped with the Poisson-Lie structure defined by the Drinfeld-Jimbo classical r-matrix $r_0 = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbf{R}_+} e_\alpha \wedge e_{-\alpha}$.

All such structures on G/K were described in [7]. It follows from [7] that any such Poisson structure on G/K is uniquely determined by an an intermediate Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{n}$ satisfying $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ and some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ which satisfies certain conditions, in particular, $\langle\lambda, \alpha^\vee\rangle = 0$ for $\alpha \in \Gamma$ and $\langle\lambda, \beta^\vee\rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$ for $\beta \in \operatorname{Span}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{n}} \setminus \operatorname{Span}\Gamma$. Here $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{n}}$ is the set of simple roots defining $\mathfrak{n}$.

Now we can describe the Poisson bracket on G/K defined by $\star_\lambda$-multiplication on $F_q[0]^{K_{q,\lambda}}$.

Theorem 25. *Assume that* $\langle\lambda_0, \alpha^\vee\rangle = 0$ *for* $\alpha \in \Gamma$ *and* $\langle\lambda_0, \beta^\vee\rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$ *for* $\beta \in \mathbf{R}_+ \setminus \operatorname{Span}\Gamma$. *Then the classical limit of* $(F_q[0]^{K_{q,\lambda_0}}, \star_{\lambda_0})$ *is the algebra* $F(G/K)$ *of regular functions on* G/K *equipped with the Poisson homogeneous structure defined by* $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{g}$ *and* λ_0.

Proof. By Theorem 22, λ_0 is J-regular, i.e., for $f_1, f_2 \in F_q[0]^{K_{q,\lambda_0}}$ we have

$$f_1 \star_{\lambda_0} f_2 = \lim_{\lambda\to\lambda_0} f_1 \star_\lambda f_2 = \mu\left(\overrightarrow{J_q(\lambda)}(f_1 \otimes f_2)\right).$$

Take $q = e^{-\frac{\hbar}{2}}$. Then $J_q\left(\frac{\lambda}{\hbar}\right) = 1 \otimes 1 + \hbar j(\lambda) + O(\hbar^2)$, and $r(\lambda) = j(\lambda) - j(\lambda)^{21}$ is the standard trigonometric solution of the classical dynamical Yang-Baxter equation (see, e.g., [1]). Thus the Poisson bracket on $F(G/K)$ that corresponds to $(F_q[0]^{K_{q,\lambda_0}}, \star_{\lambda_0})$ is given by

$$\{f_1, f_2\} = \lim_{\lambda\to\lambda_0} \mu\left(\overrightarrow{r(\lambda)}(f_1 \otimes f_2)\right)$$

for $f_1, f_2 \in F(G/K)$. By [7], this is exactly the Poisson structure defined by $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{g}$ and λ_0. □

Notice that an analogous result for simple Lie algebras of classical type was obtained in [13] using reflection equation algebras.

References

[1] P. Etingof and O. Schiffmann. Lectures on the dynamical Yang-Baxter equations. In: *Quantum groups and Lie theory (Durham, 1999):* 89–129, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 290, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2001.

[2] P. Etingof and K. Styrkas. Algebraic integrability of Macdonald operators and representations of quantum groups. *Compositio Math.*, **114** (1998), 125–152.

[3] J.C. Jantzen. *Einhüllende Algebren halbeinfacher Lie-Algebren.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[4] A. Joseph. *Kostant's problem, Goldie rank and the Gelfand-Kirillov conjecture. Invent. Math.*, **56** (1980), 191–213.

[5] A. Joseph. *Quantum groups and their primitive ideals.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[6] A. Joseph and G. Letzter. Verma modules annihilators for quantized enveloping algebras. *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.*, **28** (1995), 493–526.

[7] E. Karolinsky, K. Muzykin, A. Stolin, and V. Tarasov. Dynamical Yang-Baxter equations, quasi-Poisson homogeneous spaces, and quantization. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, **71** (2005), 179–197.

[8] E. Karolinsky, A. Stolin, and V. Tarasov. Irreducible highest weight modules and equivariant quantization. *Advances in Math.*, **211** (2007), 266–283.

[9] L. Korogodski and Y. Soibelman. *Algebras of functions on quantum groups.* American Mathematical Society, 1998.

[10] V. Mazorchuk. A twisted approach to Kostant's problem. *Glasgow Math. J.*, **47** (2005), 549–561.

[11] V. Mazorchuk, C. Stroppel. Categorification of (induced) cell modules and the rough structure of generalized Verma modules. *Advances in Math.*, **219** (2008), 1363–1426.

[12] V. Mazorchuk, C. Stroppel. Categorification of Wedderburns basis for $\mathbb{C}[S_n]$. *Arch. Math.*, **91** (2008), 1–11.

[13] A. Mudrov. Quantum conjugacy classes of simple matrix groups. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **272** (2007), 635–660.

E.K.: Department of Mathematics, Kharkov National University,
4 Svobody Sq., Kharkov 61077, Ukraine
e-mail: `eugene.a.karolinsky@univer.kharkov.ua`

A.S.: Department of Mathematics, University of Göteborg,
SE-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden
e-mail: `astolin@math.chalmers.se`

V.T.: St. Petersburg Branch of Steklov Mathematical Institute,
Fontanka 27, St. Petersburg 191023, Russia;
Department of Mathematical Sciences, IUPUI,
Indianapolis, IN 46202, USA
e-mail: `vt@pdmi.ras.ru; vt@math.iupui.edu`